

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-25 have been examined. Claims 1-25 are all the claims pending in the application.

Formal matters

Applicant thanks the Examiner for accepting the drawings as filed on September 4, 2003, and for acknowledging claim to foreign priority and receipt of a certified copy of the priority document. Applicant also thanks the Examiner for reviewing and initialing the documents in the Information Disclosure Statements submitted on September 4, 2003, April 29, 2004, and November 17, 2005.

Specification

Applicant herein amends the specification to address certain formalities. No new matter has been added, and Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to enter the amendments into the record.

Claim objections

Claims 14, 19, and 20 stand objected to for informalities. Applicant has herein amended Claims 14, 19, and 20 as suggested by the Examiner and respectfully requests the Examiner to remove the objection.

Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 7, 9, 10, 11, 16, 24, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite because of the use of the phrase “packets other than the

prioritized packets". Applicant has amended the claim to remove this phrase, and thus respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

Allowable subject matter

The Examiner has indicated that Claims 1-8 would be allowable if amended to address the § 112, second paragraph rejections. Applicant has amended Claims 1-8 as indicated above, and thus respectfully requests the Examiner to allow Claim 1-8.

Claim 18 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant has rewritten claim 18 in independent form and respectfully requests the Examiner to allow claim 18.

Claim rejections

Claims 9-11, 14, 16, 21, 24, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,490,629 to Milliken. Claims 12 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Milliken in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,529,519 to Steiner. Claims 13 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Milliken in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,977,896 to Kobayash. Claims 15, 17, 22, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Milliken in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,757,801 to Arimilli.

Independent claims 9, 10, 11, 16, 24, and 25 each recite the features of 1) when packets are transmitted, the packets are sorted into prioritized packets and non-prioritized packets; 2) the sorted prioritized packets are encapsulated as a broadcast or multicast encapsulated

packet; and 3) the broadcast or multicast capsulated packet are transmitted. This configuration makes it possible to enhance the transmission efficiency of packets in a wireless LAN and ensure the quality of real time communication in the wireless LAN.

In an exemplary embodiment of the invention, when small packets, such as voice RTP packets, are periodically sent one by one, the RTP packets of each session are combined into one, which in turn is transmitted as a broadcast or multicast capsulated packet in a mode requiring no ACK reply (see, e.g., page 9, lines 17-22 of the specification).

Accordingly, the exemplary embodiment addresses such issues as a) since the wireless LAN headers were large and the RTP packets were of short packets, the original transmission rate could not be utilized (see, e.g., page 2, lines 12-14); and b) when a large number of RTP sessions are developed or broadcasted through the wireless LAN, the transmission and reception of a short packet frequently occur and hence its header increases markedly in band consumption, so that the quality of voice and moving pictures is degraded (see, e.g., page 10, lines 16-20).

By contrast, the cited references fail to disclose or teach that the sorted prioritized packets are capsulated and transmitted as a broadcast or multicast capsulated packet.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference, either alone or in any conceivable combination, would not result in the subject matter of claims 9, 10, 11, 16, 24 and 25. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9, 10, 11, 16, 24 and 25 are patentable over the cited references, either alone or in combination. The remaining claims are patentable based on their respective dependencies.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin C. Kunzendorf
Registration No. 58,308

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 17, 2007